Amendment Dated: July 15, 2009

Reply to Office Action dated: April 30, 2009

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10 -19, 21 and 22 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aycock, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,765,138) in view of Piggot, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/015736 A1).

Aycock discloses the following in lines 23 – 30 of col. 11:

In addition, if the supplier is a recognized vendor from previous projects, the main processing system **68** may prompt the user of the business system **70** evaluating the RFP/RFQ responses whether the supplier should be automatically approved, as well as prompt to access the vendor database for existing action registers, vendor historical performance or prior on-site audit reports for the vendor selected.

Aycock discloses a system for evaluating RFP/RFQ responses.

Piggot discloses the following in paragraph [0014]:

[0014] The database may include an application that determines whether an identified user matches a participant profile, for the market research, so that an identified user is only asked a question if they meet the participant profile.

Piggot determines if a user of transaction qualifies for market research and asks questions if they qualify for the research.

Aycock and/or Piggot taken separately or together do not disclose or anticipate steps c and e of claim 1 as amended and those claims dependent thereon. Namely,

- c) accessing a database that stores information about various users including weights assigned by the various users and detail level assigned to the various users;
- e) if a record relating to said party exists in said database, providing information relating to a relationship between said

Amendment Dated: July 15, 2009

Reply to Office Action dated: April 30, 2009

enterprise and said party to said user, based upon the detail level assigned to the user.

Aycock and/or Piggot taken separately or together do not disclose or anticipate elements d2 and d4 of claim 12 as amended and those claims dependent thereon.

Namely,

d2) accessing a database that stores information about various users, including weights to be assigned by various users and detail level assigned to the various users;

d4) if a record relating to said party exists in said database, send said information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party to said computer, based upon the detail level assigned to said user using said computer.

An advantage of applicants claimed invention over the cited art is that not everyone in an organization is authorized to have full access to all information the organization has. For instance different divisions of the organization may have access to different levels of information to comply with non-disclosure agreements entered into between a division and another company. Also, if one of the divisions is a government supplier and another division of the organization is a commercial supplier the commercial supplier, would not be allowed to have access to all the government suppliers data because of government security classifications.

Amendment Dated: July 15, 2009

Reply to Office Action dated: April 30, 2009

Claims 9 and 20 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aycock, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,765,138) and Piggot, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/015736 A1) in view of Klingman (U.S. Patent No. 5,950,173).

Klingman discloses the following in his abstract:

A remote communication system for facilitating secure on-line evaluation of goods based upon consumers' satisfaction through electronic media wherein a suitable local user input device in association with a data transmission system, couples the user input to a packet network system for communicating to a remote receiver/decoder apparatus to obtain a potentially desired scoring information such as an electronic evaluation form regarding a previously purchased product. Upon a selection of scoring option by the user a telcom network communication link for communicating a telephone number associated with the desired product from the user to the remote receiver allows the user to score the desired product. The telcom connection, linking the user input device to the remote server device may also include a toll-free 800 telephone number system to encourage shoppers to perform evaluations of purchased products without incurring costs associated therewith. During the telcom connection, a buyer identification number may be used to limit rating input to one evaluation per buyer thereby increasing accuracy of product evaluation.

Klingman discloses a remote communication system for facilitating secure on-line evaluation of goods based upon consumer satisfaction.

Aycock, Piggot and/or Klingman taken separately or together do not disclose or anticipate steps c and e of claim 1 as amended and those claims dependent thereon.

Namely,

- c) accessing a database that stores information about various users including weights assigned by the various users and detail level assigned to the various users;
- e) if a record relating to said party exists in said database, providing information relating to a relationship between said

Amendment Dated: July 15, 2009

Reply to Office Action dated: April 30, 2009

enterprise and said party to said user, based upon the detail level assigned to the user.

Aycock, Piggot and/or Klingman taken separately or together do not disclose or anticipate elements d2 and d4 of claim 12 as amended and those claims dependent thereon. Namely,

d2) accessing a database that stores information about various users, including weights to be assigned by various users and detail level assigned to the various users;

d4) if a record relating to said party exists in said database, send said information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party to said computer, based upon the detail level assigned to said user using said computer.

Claims 31-34 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aycock, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,765,138) and Piggot, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/015736 A1) in view of Crockett (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0039631).

Crockett discloses the following in paragraphs 0006 and 0007.

[0006] In one aspect, a method includes entering scores into a computer system with respect to an organization's customer relationship management capabilities and causing the computer system to generate an assessment of the organization's customer relationship management capabilities based on the scores.

[0007] According to some implementations, the computer system can generate an overall assessment of the organization's customer relationship management capabilities using a weighted score of each of the capabilities. The computer system also can generate an assessment of each of the organization's customer relationship management capabilities using a weighted score of each of the capabilities.

Amendment Dated: July 15, 2009

Reply to Office Action dated: April 30, 2009

Crockett discloses a software tool that access organization management capabilities by using weighted scores.

Aycock, Piggot and/or Crockett taken separately or together do not disclose or anticipate steps c and e of claim 1 as amended and those claims dependent thereon.

Aycock, Piggot and/or Crockett taken separately or together do not disclose or anticipate elements d2 and d4 of claim 12 as amended and those claims dependent thereon.

In view of the above claims 1-3, 6-21 and claims 31-34 are patentable. If the Examiner has any questions would be please call the undersigned at the telephone number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald Reichman/ Ronald Reichman Reg. No. 26,796 Attorney of Record Telephone (203) 924-3854

PITNEY BOWES INC. Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department 35 Waterview Drive Shelton, CT 06484